

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/980,183

Applicant(s)

HAMADA ET AL.

Examiner

Vivek D Koppikar

Art Unit

1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Vivek D Koppikar.

(3)_____.

(2) Joshua Randall.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 05 August 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent Number 6,347,016.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Vivek Koppikar 8/5/03

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner suggested the following to the applicants' attorney: 1) Clarifying and possibly amending the phrase "a space surrounded by the surface of the magnetic disc and the concave portion is open to art at a peripheral end portion of the magnetic disc" in claim 1 2) using the term "slave disc" in place of "magnetic disc" and 3) The bodies of Claims 1-10 recite limitations that arise when the master disc is contact with the slave disc so the examiner suggests changing the preambles of Claims 1-10 to reflect this .